

REMARKS

The Advisory Action mailed January 24, 2005 has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-21 remain pending in this application and currently stand rejected. By entry of this amendment, claims 1, 14, and 15 are amended, and claims 29 and 30 are added. Applicant requests that, in light of the foregoing amendment and arguments below, the rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The previous Final Office Action, dated October 4, 2006, rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,864,613 to Flood (hereinafter *Flood*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,953,202 to Newell (hereinafter *Newell*). Because neither *Flood* nor *Newell*, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests every element of claims 1-21, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

As an example, amended independent claim 1 provides, in part:

a delay input element configured:
to receive an input indicating a delay request when the circuit between
the telephone line and telephone is about to be obstructed; and
to delay obstructing the circuit between the telephone line and
telephone upon receiving the input.

In rejecting this claim, the previous Final Office Action stated that *Newell* discloses a delay element, but this is not the case. Specifically, the Action noted:

Newell teaches a call barring circuit that can be configured for either allowing or barring outgoing calls by a barring circuit user, wherein the barring circuit user can override barring mode that allows the user to make a desired outgoing call by entering a dialed code that matches a stored authorization code. In the instant, it is obvious that the barring or obstructing of the circuit is temporarily delayed until its barring mode is activated back after completion of the call.

Newell does not disclose a delay input element configured to receive an input indicating a delay request when the circuit between a telephone line and telephone is about to be obstructed and to delay obstructing the circuit between the telephone line and telephone upon receiving the input. *Newell* does include a delay element 30 as a part of pulse processing circuit 11. However, *Newell's* delay element is not "configured to receive an input indicating a delay request," nor does *Newell's* delay element "delay obstructing the circuit between the telephone line and

telephone upon receiving the input." The delay element 30 of *Newell* is merely an automated delay used in processing pulses.

The previous Final Office Action stated that "it is obvious that barring or obstructing of the circuit is temporarily delayed until its barring mode is activated back after completion of the call." Even were it obvious that *Newell* included such a temporary delay, this obviously does not constitute the delay input element being configured to receive an input indicating a delay request as recited in claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn and the claim allowed. Furthermore, the rejections of claims 2-14, which ultimately depend from claim 1, should be withdrawn since the claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their base claim.

Independent claim 15 provides a method of controlling telephone usage including steps of:

signaling the impending obstructing of the circuit between the telephone line
and the telephone when the time is almost equal to the time reference,
receiving an input from a delay input device indicating a desire to delay
obstructing the circuit, and
delaying the obstructing of the circuit.

Neither *Newell* nor *Flood* discloses these elements. *Newell* may include a delay element 30 as a part of pulse processing circuit 11. However, *Newell*'s delay element does not permit input indicating a desire to delay obstructing the circuit. *Flood* provides no teaching of receiving an input from a delay input device. Neither *Newell* nor *Flood* teaches or suggests all the elements recited in claim 15, and therefore Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn and the claim allowed. Moreover, rejected claims 16-21, depending from claim 15, are allowable for at least the same reasons as their base claim, and therefore their rejections should also be withdrawn.

New Claims

Claims 29 and 30 have been appended to the application by this amendment, although no new matter has been added. Independent claim 29 embodies many of the features of claim 15, as well as other claims, and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 15. Likewise, claim 30 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 29, from which it depends.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application and allowance of the claims at an early date are hereby solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this matter, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's undersigned attorney at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC

Date: March 3, 2006

By:

Colin S. Wright
Colin S. Wright
Reg. No. 57,202

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5100

